

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-18 and 20-46 remain pending in the application.

Allowable Claims

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 8-10 and 20-22 are allowed.

Informalities in Claims 39-46

In the Office Action, claims 39-46 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 39-46 have been carefully reviewed, and appropriately amended herein to be more definite.

Claims 39-46 are now in full conformance with 35 USC 112. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4, 7, 11-17, 23-29 and 31-46 over Nevo

Claims 1-4, 7, 11-17, 23-29 and 31-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,600,726 to Nevo et al. ("Nevo"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-4, 7, 11-17 and 23-29 are amended herein to recite that time slots are not assigned to receive from both said first radio system and said second radio system at a same time. Claims 31-46 recite that scheduling assures that a first radio system does not transmit at a time that a second radio system is receiving, and that no time slot is assigned to receive such that time slots are not assigned to receive from both the first radio system and the second radio system at a same time.

The Examiner cites Fig. 10, and col. 5, lines 21-26 of Nevo for allegedly teaching a multiplexer adapted to time multiplex transmissions from first and second radio systems based on a timing of a synchronous connection-oriented connection of the first radio system. (Office Action at 3). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The cited Nevo reference relies upon a system as shown in Fig. 2 to interface two radio systems that interfere with each other (e.g., Bluetooth and 802.11 systems). In the Nevo system, a selected radio transceiver (102a and 102b) is assigned a time slot for transmitting during which the non-selected radio system can not receive or transmit. Importantly, the remaining time slots are assigned to allow both radios to receive information. As shown in Fig. 2: transceiver 102a transmits in slot T1, transceiver 102b transmits in slot T3, and both transceivers 102a and 102b can receive information in slots T2 and T4. This same relationship concerning when the different transceivers can transmit and receive shows up in Figs. 8a, 8b, and 10 of the Nevo reference. It is clear from Fig. 10 of Nevo, which the Examiner cites, that the TX and RX cycles are NOT coordinated in any way with time-slots of the stand-alone Bluetooth radio (shown in the second graph of Nevo's Fig. 10)

In the present application, a first radio occupies periodic time slots during which the first radio can transmit and receive data, and the second radio can not transmit data during these time slots. During all the remaining unoccupied time slots (i.e., the stolen time slots) the second radio is allowed to transmit and receive data. A key distinction of the present invention from the cited Nevo is that the present invention assigns time slots to one of the two radios at a time, i.e., the time slots are not co-shared as in the Nevo reference. The rejected claims, as now amended, do not assign time slots during which either (or both) of the transceivers can receive data, as taught by Nevo.

For these and other reasons, claims 1-4, 7, 11-17, 23-29 and 31-46 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307